

# ECONOMIC COUNCIL LETTER



April 15, 1959

1930—1959

Letter No. 453

## What—Another Summit Meeting!

*"You should not take too seriously the treaties made with the Imperialists. Lenin, too, signed a peace treaty after World War I that remained valid only as long as it proved necessary."*

So spoke Nikita Khrushchev to East German communist leaders during his recent tour of East Germany.

Americans, do you believe we should be a party to a summit meeting with a man holding such sentiments?

**WE SHOULD NOT ATTEND A SUMMIT MEETING.**  
We will only be defeated as we have been in the past.

The Soviets have made almost uninterrupted gains since 1933. These gains have meant practically uninterrupted losses to the United States.

Our country with its manpower and material resources has been the greatest prop to the Soviet movement anywhere in the world. Without the United States, communism would long since have fallen apart.

**J**UST in the past twelve months, there have been notable gains to the Soviets with resultant undermining of American prestige.

There has been Iraq, which, after our folly in forcing the partitioning of Palestine in 1947, we have considered the strongest center of resistance to communism in the Middle East. Now almost without question Iraq is gone. We learn this from authorities in Iraq itself. Many press dispatches seem to confirm it. We have lost Middle East oil—subject only to the fact the Middle East oil now needs Western markets. We have lost one of the most strategic areas in the world. And by marked favoritism toward Israel we have thrown away the good will of 40 million Arabs. Not a happy picture to reflect upon.

The United States set up the treaty with Turkey, Iraq, Iran, Great Britain, and Pakistan. We were so sure of Iraq that we named it the "Baghdad Pact." But now Baghdad and Iraq are gone.

There is Cuba which came under our control in 1898, and to which we gave independence in 1902. Cuba has been the vacation place for many thousands of Americans. Hundreds of millions of American treasure have been invested there. Yet our Government must have known that Castro, who is either a fellow-traveler or a communist, aimed to seize the country. And the United States ruled out any help to those Cubans who sought to defend themselves against communist tyranny. And we permitted vessels to carry munitions from American coasts to Castro himself. We treated Cuba as we treated Hungary.

And now we have the makings of a communist Soviet Socialist Republic within ninety miles of the mainland of the United States!

There is neither satisfaction nor safety in this—for Americans.

There is Tibet, a nation of a million or more liberty-loving human beings which has been attacked by the Chinese Reds; and huge numbers of Buddhist monks and others have been executed. Fortunately, the Dalai Lama, the so-called god-king of the Tibetans, has escaped to India.

And there is, of course, Berlin, and Khrushchev's threat to throw American and other Allied troops out by May 27.

All these events have led to the provisional agreement for another summit meeting.

The summit meeting of 1955 resulted, as Ike was forewarned, in "loss of face for America and enhanced prestige for Soviet Russia." Another summit meeting would mean further loss of face for us. It could spell the destruction of our country.

Why should we have a summit meeting about Berlin—why not about Poland, Hungary, and other satellite countries—and about the fate of the still unaccounted for American airmen whose unarmed plane was shot down over Armenia?

**W**HY don't we stand in our tracks and fight? Whenever we have called the Soviet's bluff, we have won.

A prominent former communist told one of our officers recently—"The more we deal with Soviet Russia the more nails we are driving in our own coffin."

The communist newspaper *The Worker*, on March 29, 1959, had a front page headline "MORE PRESSURE SEEN NEEDED TO GET IKE TO SUMMIT."

However, we believe the President has been stiffening in his treatment of Soviet Russia. We believe he is getting tired of being pushed around. In his speech in Washington before the NATO Council Meeting of April 1, he stated that we would not have peace until the communists give up their ambition to conquer the world.

Many of our statesmen boast of the leadership of the West by the United States. But the United States has been leading 170 million Americans, and the rest of the Western world, straight into the slavery of the USSR.

**T**HERE should be no summit meeting. Or, if there must be one, we should first demand satisfaction for the shooting down of that unarmed transport plane over Russian Armenia last September. We should demand an accounting for the 2000 Americans John Noble says are held in the same kind of concentration camps that he was in for seven years. And we should demand satisfaction for other grievances we have against the USSR.

Otherwise there should be no summit meeting. For if there is, we may lose everything the West has and is.

**A**ND yet America seems to have no positive program. We think it perfectly evident why we have none. We have a President who, however good his motives, is obviously giving less time to the Presidency than seems to many desirable. Our Secretary of State, for all his courage, is unfortunately ill with a dread disease. But worse than any of these disadvantages is the fact that our Government is honeycombed with people who are appeasing communism. Some of them are communists themselves.

Meanwhile, the American Republic grows weaker here at home. It was a high communist official on the West Coast who called the Supreme Court's pro-communist decisions of 1957 "the greatest victory the Communist Party in America has ever received."

Communist infiltration has by no means limited itself to Government bureaus. Worst perhaps of all, it has penetrated some of the great Protestant organizations, such as the National Council of Churches, which claims to speak

for 37 million Protestants. The National Council of Churches, many of whose leaders seem inclined toward personal notoriety, has a way of appointing Study Conferences which are assigned to consider various problems.

The World Order Study Conference, November 21, 1958 in Cleveland, Ohio, voted to recommend that the United States recognize the Red Government of China—that Government which has still failed to account for at least five hundred American soldiers who fell into its hands, and which tortured some thousands of American prisoners. Immediately there was protest from many Protestants who asserted that the National Council of Churches had no right to speak for the membership of the churches. Thereupon, officials of the National Council took refuge in the assertion that this recommendation was not an official report of the National Council, but only of a "Study Conference." But the National Council, of course, knew perfectly well that if a "Study Conference" made a report and gave it publicity, the mischief would be done. No amount of publicity now, on the part of Protestants or of the National Council itself can catch up with the harm such an incident causes.

And there have been other such incidents.

We grow weaker at home as we grow weaker abroad.

Our minds and hands are paralyzed through communist infiltration in Government, in all means of communication, in labor unions, even in business groups.

The record so far shows that the Soviets are going all out to enslave the United States. The Soviets are willing to do more to enslave the people of the United States, than Americans have so far shown themselves willing to do to save themselves.

**Y**ET we are convinced there is still time to turn the whole trend and root communism out of the nation.

This will only happen if enough red-blooded American men and women in each of the Congressional districts are willing to give the time to work with their Congressmen and Senators and advise them. The advice can be diplomatic and gentle so long as it works.

But the people themselves can rise to great political strength if they realize the mortal danger we are in and if they have the guts to go to work.

### The Stake in Berlin

One or more officers of the Council have visited Germany many times since World War II, and have maintained close contact with informed persons there. In recent days, we have asked some of them to comment on Berlin:

One of our correspondents replied:

"If the Western world gives Berlin to the Soviets—it does not matter to Soviet Russia or Soviet East Germany—this will mean that West Germany is next, and France after that, until the Soviets stand on the Atlantic. It will also be only a matter of time till they get the British Isles."

Another answered:

"As to Berlin, the situation is so unclear, and we

Germans feel so helpless that we can only wait and see. . . . We know, however, that we depend entirely on the United States' decisions; that our fate, the fate of Europe and the world, depends upon what the American Government decides.

"As long as American families are in Germany and in Berlin, we feel rather secure. There is talk, however, of withdrawing them. I think there couldn't be a greater shock than that. Practically all Germans think this way. The minute you Americans withdraw your families, we know we are abandoned. People in Switzerland and Norway say that we have one more year to live. But Germans refuse to think. They only hope."

One of the great German figures in the war said:

"Of course, all thinking Germans are very much concerned about the Berlin question, even if they also see the other trouble-spot which is perhaps for world politics much more important: Iraq and Persia. All Germans think that the U.S.A. made the biggest mistake to fight against Nasser instead of giving him even a little finger, which would have been sufficient in July 1958, to unify Iraq with the United Arab Republic, which, as we see it now, would have been the only good solution for the world. Now in the last two or three months, but too late, the U.S.A. is giving Nasser even more than one little finger; but we think that this will not help too much.

"There is the general feeling that in the methods of cold war, Russia is far superior to the U.S.A. Germans are very afraid that in spite of conferences and coming conferences, Russia will go her way, step by step, in order to win over Berlin. Each single step will be so little and so small that Western opinion will see it only much later, and each little single step would really not be possible to be answered by war. As Russia has taken her time in the cold war, she will take her time in the Berlin question, too; and adding up ten or fifteen little steps they will have made perhaps in the twelve coming months, the Western world will awake one day and find it has lost Berlin.

"Generally, public opinion not only in Germany, but I think also in France and Spain, is really worried, and I am wondering what solution will be possible for the Western world without losing face forever."

### The Myth About Anne Frank?

The following condensation of two articles published several months ago in the Swedish journal *FRIA ORD* is submitted for the information of our readers, inasmuch as the statements they contain have received little or no publicity in America.

History has many examples of myths that live a longer and richer life than truth, and may become more effective than truth.

The Western World has for some years been made aware of a Jewish girl through the medium of what purports to be her personally written story, "Anne Frank's Diary." Any informed literary inspection of this book would have shown it to have been impossible as the work of a teenager.

A noteworthy decision of the New York Supreme Court confirms this point of view, in that the well known American Jewish writer, Meyer Levin, has been awarded \$50,000 to be paid him by the father of Anne Frank as an honorarium for Levin's work on the "Anne Frank Diary."

Mr. Frank, in Switzerland, has promised to pay to his race-kin, Meyer Levin, not less than \$50,000 because he had used the dialogue of Author Levin, just as it was, and "implanted" it in the diary as being his daughter's intellectual work.

### The Junior League

The American business community is becoming more and more aware of the pressures, controls, and red-tape from swollen bureaucratic government. Important business groups like the National Association of Manufacturers, and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, as well as many individual companies, are getting into the field of practical political action by training men and women to vote—and VOTE AMERICAN. This is just what the Economic Council has been advocating for years.

In addition, we suggest another project which needs immediate attention; one which, if carried out, will accomplish wonders at the local and national levels. It will contribute greatly to the fight to save America. Your advice and counsel are needed by YOUR OWN FAMILY.

Recently, the Junior League, in the Chicago area, announced a new series of radio programs called "Search for Peace." We wonder what kind of "peace" is meant when we note the background and performance of their speakers. You be the judge! Among them we find Pearl Buck, Norman Cousins, Clifford Case (N.J.), Harold Stassen, Lester Pearson, Drew Pearson, and Bertrand Russell.

Such programs will do much to undermine the education planned by business groups, because the effect of these fuzzy thinkers, with the *wrong answers*, will further confuse and complicate the problems to be solved.

Apparently, much of the program planning by the Junior League, League of Women Voters, and the American Association of University Women, is based on the left-wing socialist philosophy of government, for their speakers are predominantly of that ilk. The above list is typical.

Members of these lively organizations are usually fine, bright, active Americans with time and energy to devote to worthy and necessary causes. They are YOUR wives and daughters. If you will show them the paradox in promoting programs which, in effect, nullify our desperate efforts to save free America and their own liberties, surely they will cooperate. We suggest you urge them to reorient their programs with sound pro-American principles and practices, bringing speakers and study material to the community which will safeguard our country.

When all indications and testimony prove that "it is five minutes until midnight" for your business and your nation, surely *your own families* should not be working in opposite directions. It's YOUR MOVE! Won't you speak to your family?

## WOULD YOU NOW GIVE AWAY OUR PANAMA CANAL?

"The great American Giveaway series did not start with the Marshall Plan in 1947, nor with Yalta in 1945, nor with Teheran in 1943. IT STARTED AT PANAMA (in 1936): WHERE WILL IT STOP?"

This was our headlining in 1953, of the first of Earl Harding's series of Council Letters and Papers, all later reprinted in the *Congressional Record*. Again in 1954, '55 and '56, Mr. Harding made it plain that the United States policy of appeasement and surrender would lead to expropriation by Panama, or to internationalization.

Now the internationalist giveaways have been joined by two Stanford University professors, Martin B. Travis and James T. Watkins. They argue at great length in the current *Foreign Affairs* (quarterly review of the Council on Foreign Relations) that the Panama Canal is vulnerable to modern war weapons, and that it would be safer for the United States to give the Panama Canal over to United Nations control and operation.

Neither Panamanians nor North Americans of this generation know how and by whom the little Republic of Panama was created. That history, documented, and in challenging form, *The Untold Story of Panama*, by Earl Harding, published by Athene Press, Inc., will be released on April 27, and will be reviewed in the Economic Council Letter of May 1.

## BOOK REVIEW

Not a great deal is known in America about the so-called "liberation" of Italy. So Dr. Luigi Villari has written a book under just that name—*The Liberation of Italy*.

We have had long talks with Dr. Villari at his home in Rome, and have found him a very real historian. He lived through the events of 1943 to 1946. Probably no writer can deal with the subject more accurately.

He shows that the "liberation," as in France, was not so much to dispose of the Nazis as to give the so-called "Partisans" carte-blanc to murder and rob and pillage. It took the "liberation" to set the communists up in business and give them the tremendous power in Italy they have had ever since. Incidentally, in these terrible years, the Partisans had the generous support of the Allies. The whole thing was a repetition of what took place in France at about the same time.

No one who wishes to understand communism today (and every American must, if he wants his country to survive) should fail to read this book. It has a close connection with the great danger America faces today.

*The Liberation of Italy*, by Luigi Villari, C. C. Nelson Publishing Co. 252 pages, \$5.00 postpaid. ORDER DIRECT from National Economic Council. 7501 Empire State Bldg., New York 1, N. Y.

This Council Letter may be quoted in whole or part provided due credit is given to the National Economic Council, Inc., Empire State Building, New York 1, N. Y., and quotation is specified to be from Economic Council Letter 453, April 15, 1959.

NATIONAL ECONOMIC COUNCIL, INC., established in 1930, is a non-profit, non-partisan membership corporation organized under New York State law. It publishes the semi-monthly ECONOMIC COUNCIL LETTER and occasional ECONOMIC COUNCIL PAPERS.

OFFICERS: President, Merwin K. Hart. Executive Vice President, Constance G. Dall. Vice Presidents: Lt. Gen. P. A. del Valle, U.S. M.C., retired, Vice Adm. C. S. Freeman, U.S.N., retired, Earl Harding, George S. Montgomery, Jr., Dr. Elwood Rowsey, A. Margaret Schmid, Ora A. Taylor; Secretary, McKay Twombly; Assistant Secretary, Sibylla Schilling; Treasurer, Baird Parks; Director of Research, Norman Dodd.

Subscription \$10 a year, \$6 for six months, \$3.50 for three months. Special rate for student or teacher \$5 a year. Air Mail Subscription (domestic) \$12.00 a year, Air Mail (foreign) \$15.00 a year.

EXTRA COPIES of this Council Letter 15c each (8 for \$1), \$9 per 100, \$50 per 1,000.

Special prices will be quoted for larger quantities. Please add 3% sales tax for deliveries in Greater New York and 4% shipping charges on quantities of 100 or more.

National Economic Council, Inc., Empire State Building, New York 1, N. Y.  
903 First National Bank Bldg., Utica 2, N. Y.

# ECONOMIC COUNCIL LETTER

May 15, 1959

1930—1959

Letter No. 454

## "Collective Security"—For What?

THE political decline of the United States can be traced by slogans, like "agrarian reform" to pinpoint our neutrality during the conquest of China by the communists, and "flexibility" to pinpoint apathy during the coming sell-out of Germany.

It is easy to misinterpret this apparent power of slogans. It does not prove stupidity of the voters. Actually, the slogan is the small visible tip of the organized political blocs which are struggling beneath the surface to take over the political power as the old parties decay in all western countries.

"COLLECTIVE security" is one of the most important of these slogans, whose real significance is the skill and organization of the political blocs which use them for currency. It is silly to consider the slogans of the collectivists without considering the sources of their political power, because we must defeat the power system, not the slogan.

In December 1937, an important speech was made by C. A. Hathaway, editor of the communist *Daily Worker*. This gives the best insight into the meaning of "collective security."

The speaker warmly praised President Roosevelt's "quarantine the aggressor" speech of the preceding month, in which he attacked the Nazis and Fascists as aggressors, and urged other nations to unite to "quarantine" them. Hathaway said:

"War in any part of the world directly endangers our own peace and our own security. It has served to reopen the fundamental discussion of isolationism versus collective security as the basis for our foreign policy."

He urged a foreign policy of concerted action by all the "democratic" nations, with the aim of protecting "world peace and democracy." He praised President Roosevelt's speech for uniting the "peace-loving" nations, and for associating world peace with democracy. He bitterly opposed the neutrality legislation and other efforts in Con-

gress to prevent our country from being swept into war as it had been in 1917. He worked out the technique of identifying all opponents of concerted action by the "democracies" against the "aggressors" as isolationists, and identified the isolationists with Big Business, Fascism, Toryism, and friendship for Germany and Japan. "The real issue," he said, "is collective security, before it is too late."

The editor of the *Daily Worker* clearly equated the "aggressor nations" with opponents of the Soviet Union. He promised Roosevelt whole-hearted support, if he based his foreign policy "squarely on the policies proposed in that speech."

Of course, there was a great deal of backing and filling on both sides between 1937 and the adoption by Congress of the policy of "collective security" implemented by the United Nations Charter. Can anyone miss the similarity between that speech and the slogans of today?

IT was about 1942, when the first outward signs appeared that a movement was under way to commit us to collective security at the end of the Second World War, but to do so without permitting the people or their representatives in Congress to have a voice in the matter. Perhaps the best evidence of this movement was the report of the Committee for a Just and Durable Peace, to the Federal Council of Churches, which laid down the essential steps in recreating an international government, and told the assembled representatives from all over the United States to go back to their communities and carry the new political gospel with them. About the same time, academic studies by college professors belittling our earlier foreign policies began to flow from the presses. Columnists were given helpful background material. The heat was on.

Let us make clear, at once, that 98 per cent of the people involved were honestly working for a

Copyright 1959, National Economic Council, Inc.

E3

PB